University of California
University of California pu
R.W.B. JACKSON LIBRARY
OISE CIR
3 0005 03035 9221

THE CHILD-CARE CENTER

A Study of the Interaction Among One-Parent Children, Parents, and School

BY
HARRY H. L. KITANO

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA PUBLICATIONS IN EDUCATION
Volume 12, No. 5, pp. 293–344

JAN 8 1964
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL
RESEARCH LIBRARY
ONTARIO COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA PRESS
BERKELEY AND LOS ANGELES
1963

370.78
C153U
v.12, no.5

THE LIBRARY

The Ontario Institute

for Studies in Education

Toronto, Canada

C1534
V. 12, no. 5

THE CHILD-CARE CENTER

A Study of the Interaction Among One-Parent Children, Parents, and School

BY

HARRY H. L. KITANO

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA PRESS
BERKELEY AND LOS ANGELES
1963

LIBRARY
JUL 13 1968
THE ONTARIO INSTITUTE
FOR STUDIES IN EDUCATION

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA PUBLICATIONS IN EDUCATION
ADVISORY EDITORS: C. W. GORDON, FREDERICK LILGE, M. V. SEAGOE, J. C. STONE, J. A. R. WILSON

Volume 12, No. 5, pp. 293–344

Approved for Publication February 15, 1963
Issued October 29, 1963
Price, $1.25

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA PRESS
BERKELEY AND LOS ANGELES
CALIFORNIA

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
LONDON, ENGLAND

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

GRATEFUL ACKNOWLEDGMENT is hereby made to the personnel of the Santa Monica Unified School District whose assistance has been invaluable in the planning and completion of this project: Dr. Julius Stier, Director of Research; Mrs. Rosalie Waltz, Director of Guidance; Mrs. Docia Zavitovsky, Coördinator of Child Development Centers.

Special thanks are due to Mrs. Lee Murray, Director of the McKinley Nursery School, and Mrs. Gail Whitelaw, Director of the John Adams Child Development Center, and their staffs, who have given so generously of their time and provided us with space and opportunities for testing and observation. Graduate students in the School of Social Welfare of the University of California at Los Angeles who helped with the project include Mrs. Susan Corn and Mrs. Badonna Glatt; and others who lent valuable assistance include George Kagiwada, graduate student in sociology, and Alison Bishop, Diane Johnson, and Carole Stanley, for editing and typing the manuscript.

The study was conducted under Research Grant No. 1656, from the University of California.

CONTENTS

I. Introduction 293

II. The Child-Care Program in Santa Monica 299

III. Differential Child-Rearing Attitudes of Child-Care Parents and Teachers 308

IV. Adjustment of Problem and Nonproblem Children to Specific Situations 313

V. Behavior of Child-Care Children in Regular School . . . 318

VI. A Case Study 327

VII. Conclusions and Recommendations 337

Bibliography 342

THE CHILD-CARE CENTER

A Study of the Interaction Among One-Parent Children, Parents, and School

BY
HARRY H. L. KITANO

I. INTRODUCTION

In our society, the normal social unit is that of the two-parent family in which the father works and the mother stays at home with the children, at least while they are small. This normal pattern may be broken by separation, desertion, divorce, death, or other causes. The result is most often a one-parent family in which the remaining parent, usually the mother, is responsible for both the financial support of the family and the care of the house and children.

The large number of one-parent families and the rising divorce rate in our culture make the problems of this group deserving of special attention and concern. Much research has been and is being directed toward study of one-parent children; somewhat less attention has been given to problems of the single parent, probably because these are readily apparent.

The major overt difficulties for the single parent appear to be the lack of earning power and the energy required to handle children. More subtle handicaps would include loneliness, the lack of companionship with the other sex, and the reformulation of the parent role—that is, taking care of children and earning a living too.

Social workers and the related service professions have attempted, with preventive measures, to ward off the problems of the single-parent family. For example, family service agencies often try to prevent separation and divorce, laws are passed to control desertion, and public health programs aim to lengthen the human life span.

When these efforts fail, a second group of services takes over in an attempt to minimize the negative effects of the broken home. There are legal services to ease the burdens of separation and divorce, aid-to-needy- and aid-to-dependent-children programs, social security, and various other types of assistance.

Most of these programs have concentrated on giving financial help or personal counsel to the one-parent family. Another kind of assistance is provided by the child-care programs now established in many states,

notably California, to provide day care for children of working mothers. Nowhere else in the entire nation has the state taken a similar interest in both control of and support for child-care centers, and nowhere else is a child-care program tied so closely to the public schools.

The number of American working mothers is very large, and recent statistics indicate that the number is increasing. A special survey for the Children's Bureau of the Census in June, 1958, reveals that 2,873,000 women with children under 12 were employed full time (27). There was estimated total of 6,665,000 children under the age of 18 of whom 5,073,000 were under 12. It is of interest that fathers and relatives played a prominent role in the care of these children, since over 56 per cent were cared for by one or the other. Non-relatives cared for about 1 out of every 5 children under 12, and about 401,000, or 8 per cent, were expected to care for themselves. Only 121,000, or about 1 out of 40, were in group care.

When a parent is faced with the problem of taking care of children and earning a living too, she faces a series of alternative choices in arranging for the care of her children while she is out of the home. There are church and Community Chest day nurseries, private day schools, and other child-care facilities. A mother may also leave her children with friends, neighbors, a baby sitter, or with relatives. However, the kind of care children receive under these conditions will vary greatly according to the specific arrangements.

There is indication that a different character is produced in children in proportion to the extent to which the grandparents, parents, or children of the same age bring them up. Favez-Boutonier says, "It is possible to suggest that for a strictly traditional society, the grandparents are the most appropriate people to bring up the children, maintaining the style of the past; that in very rapidly changing societies parents make the best 'bringers up' of the children; but that when a society is changing too rapidly, it might tend more and more to use age-mates, children of the same age" (16, p. 140). Such a hypothesis suggests that the implications of such child-care centers as the one presently under study deserve careful analysis.

Also, much concern has been expressed about the possible negative effect on children of separation from their mothers during the day. Several studies of the adjustment of children of working mothers have been made. Essig and Morgan (15) report the adjustment of the children as poor, while Josselyn and Goldman (25) conclude that many mothers are better mothers because they work. Other studies in the

area have failed to find evidence to support either conclusion. Obviously, much research is required before definite conclusions can be made about the adjustment of one-parent children or children whose mothers work and about the optimum type of care for such children.

The present monograph is the result of a project designed to evaluate a group child-care program—that which is operated under the auspices of the Santa Monica Unified School District. The purposes of the study are:

1. To examine the program itself—its operation, facilities, and the interaction of its staff with the children and parents associated with it.

2. To explore the behavior of the various participants through role theory in an attempt to validate several hypotheses derived from it. We shall attempt to explore the interaction among parent, child, teacher, and instruction from a social-psychological point of view, considering concepts such as role, role prescriptions, role perceptions, role expectations, and role performance or behavior. These concepts are drawn from definitions based on Newcomb (36).

1. Role consists of behaviors which are more or less characteristic of all occupants of any position.

2. Role prescriptions refer to prescribed ways of carrying out necessary functions required of an occupant of a position.

3. Role perception refers to perceived role prescriptions.

4. Role expectations refer to desired role prescriptions.

5. Role behavior refers to actual behavior of the given individual. Role behavior is a motive pattern on the part of a specific individual as he takes a role. It is behavior both determined by and perceived in terms of shared frames of reference (norms).

In past studies, the basic model used in looking at the relationship between the one-parent family and its effects on child development is typically the following:

Independent Variable		Dependent Variable
X	→	Y
One-parent family, or maternal employment, etc.	←	Some aspect of adjustment viewed in attitudinal or behavioral terms

In other words, most studies utilize a one-parent family as the independent variable and the intact family for a control group, and then measure any difference between the two on a series of variables. However, the one-parent family is a gross independent variable with many components. Findings relating it and its variations to a dependent

variable, such as adjustment, will yield diverse results since a variety of intervening conditions and situations exist which affect the behavior of children. The structure of the family although important, is not as important as the functional roles assigned to and played by each of its members. This study acknowledges a relationship between structure and function, since eligibility for entering a child-care center is generally limited to those families with the structural impairment of the one-parent home. The present monograph will attempt to study the experiences of children from one-parent families in the child-care center to understand better the over-all behavior of children.

Survey of the Literature

The causal relationship between one-parent families and their psychological effects on children from these families, as well as the behavioral manifestations of such effects, have been subjects of research for a number of years. In general the belief has been that children from one-parent families and, more broadly, those from broken homes tend to exhibit characteristics which appear to be detrimental to effective functioning as members of society. Although the evidence is in this direction, a brief review of the literature fails clearly to support this belief.

Reviews of research studies are available elsewhere (47) and it is not the purpose of this monograph to duplicate this material. In general, studies deal with the relationship between broken homes and school performance (8, 9, 39, 41, 51, 52); broken homes and personal adjustment (1, 2, 3, 9, 12, 24, 29, 31, 32, 40, 41, 44, 49, 52); and broken homes and delinquency (20, 23, 34, 35, 50, 53).

Caution must be exercised in generalizing about the effects of the one-parent family. As Thorman (49) has pointed out, emotionally disturbed children do frequently come from broken homes, but unhappiness and emotional upset are not necessarily due to separation and divorce itself; rather, they may be a result of events leading up to the marital rift. Therefore, a child may feel rejected and insecure long before he finds himself in a one-parent family situation, and this new situation may only prevent him from recovering from the initial effects of the family conflict experience.

Although the general conclusion to be reached from a review of the literature is that school performance, personal adjustment, and delinquency are probably in some way related to broken homes, it is apparent that the specific way in which they are related is not clear. One of the great difficulties in most studies is the vagueness of the inde-

pendent variable, the broken home. It is apparent that this term refers to a heterogeneous group of homes disturbed either by separation, desertion, divorce, death, or those which may be incomplete due to illegitimacy. With such a variety of situations it becomes difficult to ascertain exactly what feature or features of the broken home are relevant to problems in child development. Such a "waste-basket" category does not separate out the whole series of possible emotional stresses which culminated in the breakup of the home, as in cases of divorce, desertion, and separation. It does not differentiate the effects of the traumatic experience of losing a parent by death from effects of losing a parent through marital discord. It also does not separate these situations from the problems of getting along with only one parent.

The literature is also inconsistent in that broken homes are not always synonymous with one-parent families. Whether this distinction is crucial is not quite clear. Nye (37) found little difference between one-parent families and other types of broken homes in terms of rates of delinquency, psychosomatic illnesses, and school or church adjustment.

The term "one-parent family" appears to be more limited in scope than the term "broken home." When writers use the former, they seem to suggest that the focus of interest is not particularly in the causes of the breakup of the home, but on the nature of the social interaction which occurs between the remaining parent and the child. This view assumes that a father and mother each play an essential role in the development of the child, so that if he is deprived of either, the result will be some change in the interaction process within the family, and that the effect of this change will be evident in some way (6). This position is evident in studies which interpret findings in terms of a lack of male-role model, for example.

Another view sees the remaining parent faced with unique problems which would otherwise not occur to a person with a marriage partner present, and assumes that these problems in some way affect the parent-child relationship so as to interfere with the usual development of the child (17, 18).

Although these conceptual distinctions are important, there appears to be considerable difficulty in operationalizing them so that they become useful distinctions in conducting empirical research studies. Until some success is attained in this direction, conclusions as to more specific causal relationships in this area must be deferred.

It is possible that the effects of the loss of a parent on the child may be difficult to ascertain through current empirical procedures because

they are masked by other socializing influences which compensate for the lack of a parent in the home. Although the parent may be a key agent of socialization, he fills only one of many such integrated and interlocking roles in the society, so that the loss may not be as great as one would expect. Of course, there is no doubt that such a loss is extremely traumatic for those involved, but this is not the focus of interest.

This point also suggests that the absence of a parent may be psychologically detrimental, but that its effect will not be clearly manifested behaviorally because of the involvement of the individual in other systems. In other words, there are resources within society aside from the family which affect behavioral manifestations of psychological states in which individuals may find themselves.

It is to this point that the central thesis of this monograph is addressed. If there is a relationship between one-parentness and problem behavior which cannot be affected by programs and learning opportunities it is one thing; if, however, there are influences which can positively affect child behavior these should be explored. The program of the child-care center offers opportunities for children of one-parent families to grow, learn, and develop under the care of trained personnel.

There are three aspects to this study: section ii describes the program from a structural point of view, examining eligibility, cost, support, background, philosophy, and other aspects of the centers; the next four sections, iii, iv, v, and vi, are based on empirical studies conducted in the centers, and section vii presents the summary and conclusions.

II. THE CHILD-CARE PROGRAM IN SANTA MONICA

Before presenting the actual research, a general picture of the Santa Monica child-care program will be helpful.

Organization of child-care centers in California began early in 1943 during the critical wartime shortage of defense workers. Federal funds were then made available to the states through the Lanham Act for the "Operation of day-care or extended school services for children of mothers employed in war areas" (38). In January, 1943, the California legislature passed a bill authorizing local school districts to operate child-care programs, and giving the State Superintendent of Public Instruction the responsibility for establishing standards for the care and guidance of the children enrolled in the programs.

Federal funds were withdrawn from the program after the end of World War II, in 1946, but the California legislature, recognizing the continuing need, voted to continue the program on an annual or biennial basis. In 1957, legislation to continue child-care centers without a terminal date was passed. From 1946 to 1958, children from more than 275,000 families were enrolled in California child-care centers in 46 school districts in 21 counties. There are approximately 12,000 children enrolled at one time in the 246 centers.

From 75 to 80 per cent of the children in child-care centers are from single-parent homes, and usually the supporting parent is the mother. Parents pay about one-third of the cost of the program through fees; the remainder comes from state sources. Some individual districts levy a supplementary tax.

It has been the policy of the legislature to make child-care centers available first to those who have the greatest need. Parents' fees are distributed on a sliding scale based on the total family income and the number of family members. They range from 2 to 39 cents per hour for each child: the average fee is approximately 13 cents per hour. In districts where supplemental funds are received the range may be from 2 to 44 cents.

Eligibility

Eligibility for enrollment in a child-care center is determined by state law. A child may be enrolled in a center if:

1. Both parents are employed or one parent is employed and the other is physically or mentally unable to care for the child, when the total monthly family income does not exceed $508 if there is one child in the family, and an additional $66 for each additional child.

2. One parent both supports and cares for the child, or requires not more than twelve months of education or training to qualify for employment which will make the family self-supporting; when the total monthly family income does not exceed $363 if there is one child in the family, and an additional $66 for each additional child.

3. One parent is a veteran attending school under the G.I. Bill, and the other parent is gainfully employed.

4. The parent having care and custody of the child is employed as: (*a*) a teacher qualified to teach in a California public school or in a child-care center; (*b*) a registered nurse; (*c*) a worker in the emergency harvesting of crops; (*d*) a worker in an essential industry.

5. The parent having care of the child is attending school or receiving instruction under the state Vocational Rehabilitation Program.

Families that qualify under either of the first two conditions take precedence over families eligible under the other conditions. Families that are eligible under any of the above conditions but whose income exceeds the legal limitation pay the full cost of care for their children. Full cost is determined by the actual cost of the district program per child hour (13).

Administration and Financial Support of the Program

A child-care program operated under the control of local school districts has several important advantages:

1. Standards for the housing and care of children, and for the quality and training of the personnel involved, may be explicitly stated and maintained at a high level.

2. The program is open to all families that qualify on the basis of financial need and occupational status. Rates may be adjusted according to ability to pay.

3. In most cases, child-care centers are established on school grounds. This avoids the problem of transportation.

4. Research can be and is conducted to strengthen the program.

Child-care centers were inaugurated in Santa Monica in 1943 under the federal program. When federal funds were withdrawn in 1946, and the California legislature delegated the operation of all child-care programs to local school districts, the Santa Monica Governing Board assumed responsibility for the centers, and the Santa Monica Superintendent of Schools became their principal administrative officer.

The child-care program in Santa Monica is supported by state funds, parental fees, and district taxes. As explained earlier, parents' fees vary according to ability to pay. The total hourly cost of the Santa

Monica program for fiscal 1959–1960 was 42 cents per child, somewhat higher than the state average. The California Education Code allows school districts to obtain supplemental funds for the child-care program by levying an override district tax. In 1959–1960 a tax of one cent per hundred dollars of assessed valuation (about .003% of the total school tax) was levied in Santa Monica. The funds were used, as provided by state law, for the maintenance of buildings, grounds, and equipment.

Enrollment in Child-Care Centers

At the time of the study in 1960, the Santa Monica Unified School District operated four child-care centers. Two nursery school centers—the John Adams Child Development Center and the McKinley Nursery

TABLE 1

Length of Stay of 124 Children from the Santa Monica Child-Care Program During 1959–1960

Length of stay	Number of children	Per cent
Under 6 months	24	19.4
6 months–1 year	36	29.0
1 year–2 years	42	33.9
2 years or more	22	17.7
Total	124	100.0

School—each care for 35 children from two-and-one-half years old to kindergarten age. Two extended day-care centers serve children of elementary school age: 40 at the John Muir Extended Day-Care Center and 50 at the McKinley Extended Day-Care Center. Eighty-eight per cent of all children enrolled are under eight years of age.

The demand for child care considerably exceeds the supply; there is usually a large waiting list of applicants, especially in the fall and winter. Only during the summer months, when families go on vacation, is it possible for the centers to admit children upon application.

All Santa Monica child-care centers are in operation ten and one-half hours a day, five days a week, twelve months of the year. The centers are closed on six national holidays, but they remain in operation on other days which have been designated as school holidays by the Board of Education.

Turnover in the program is very great. During the year 1959–1960,

124 children were withdrawn from the four centers. This figure does not include children withdrawn for brief vacations and later readmitted. It does, however, include children who left one of the nursery school centers to enter an extended day-care center when they reached kindergarten age, and also children who graduated from elementary school or whose parents removed them from an extended day-care center on the grounds that they were old enough to take care of themselves after school hours.

Average length of stay of the 124 children who left the child-care program in 1959–1960 was a little over a year. (See table 1.) Nearly

TABLE 2

FAMILY BACKGROUND OF 187 CHILDREN ATTENDING SANTA MONICA CHILD-CARE CENTERS DURING 1959–1960

Family background	Number of children	Per cent
Living with both parents	24	12.8
Living with mother only	156	83.4
Living with father only	6	3.2
Living with guardian	1	.5
Total	187	99.9*

* Rounding error.

20 per cent of these children had been in a center for less than six months. Turnover in the nursery school centers is somewhat greater than in the extended day-care centers; this is probably due to the fact that the younger mothers of these younger children are more likely to remarry, stop working, and keep their children at home.

BACKGROUND OF CHILD-CARE CHILDREN

A total of 187 children was enrolled at one time or another during 1959–1960 in the Santa Monica program. The great majority of them (87.1%) came from one-parent families, and in almost all cases (83.4%) the supporting parent was the mother. (See table 2.) Only one child in eight was living with both parents.

A state survey of the child-care program in California, made in 1955, found that 70.9 per cent of the families then using child-care services were one-parent families: 65.4 per cent sole mothers and 5.5 per cent sole fathers. Assuming that the population using the Santa Monica centers is not greatly atypical, it appears that there has been a signifi-

cant increase in the proportion of children of working mothers in the program. This change is probably related to the general increase in the number of working mothers and to the fact that the rules for admission to child-care programs favor them. State law provides that in selecting children for the program first consideration shall be given to those families having the greatest financial need; and in most cases the mother who must be the sole support of her family is the one who can show the greatest need.

TABLE 3

MARITAL STATUS OF PARENTS AND GUARDIANS OF 163 CHILDREN FROM ONE-PARENT FAMILIES ATTENDING SANTA MONICA CHILD-CARE CENTERS DURING 1959–1960

Marital status	Number of children	Per cent
Divorced	95	58.3
Separated	57	35.0
Widowed	8	4.9
Unmarried	3	1.8
Total	163	100.0

Almost all of the one-parent families had been broken by divorce (58.3%) or by separation (35%). (See table 3.) In a few of the latter cases, however, the father was not estranged from the mother, but was, for instance, on military duty overseas. The figure of 1.8 per cent for the unmarried mothers represents only those cases in which the mother actually stated that she had never been married; the actual proportion is probably higher since most unmarried mothers naturally prefer to represent themselves as widowed or divorced.

Ninety per cent of these one-parent families had a gross monthly income of less than $400, and almost 40 per cent had monthly incomes of less than $300. (See table 4.) Of the two-parent families, on the other hand, nearly half had gross monthly incomes above $400, while only three families had less than $300 per month.

The typical child-care parent in Santa Monica, then, is a woman who has lost her husband and who must support herself and her child or children on a very small income. She probably has had a high school education or less and is employed at a clerical, sales, or factory job. She

changes jobs more often and moves from one house or apartment to another much more often than the average family. (For a study of the child-rearing attitudes of the child-care parent, see section iii.)

Staff and Program

The nursery school centers are staffed by a director, four teachers, a cook, a housekeeper, and a part-time nurse. The extended day-care centers are staffed by a director and two teachers who work full or part time depending on the needs of the program. A school psychologist

TABLE 4

Gross Monthly Income of Parents of 187 Children Attending Santa Monica Child-Care Centers During 1959–1960

Gross monthly income (in dollars)	One-parent families		Two-parent families	
	Number of Children	Per cent	Number of children	Per cent
Under 100	5	3.1	..	....
101–200	8	4.9	..	....
201–300	50	30.7	3	12.5
301–400	82	50.6	10	41.7
401–500	6	3.9	4	16.7
501–600	7	4.3	3	12.5
601–700	3	1.8	1	4.1
701–800	1	.6	..	....
Over 800	1	.6	3	12.5
Total	163	100.5*	24	100.0

* Rounding error.

visits each of the four centers every other week for two hours of observation and consultation with the director and staff.

The number of teachers assigned to a center depends on a variety of factors, including the number of children enrolled and their ages, the hours of operation, the amount of time per day the children are in attendance, the degree of experience of the teachers, and the school's physical facilities. Average teacher-child ratio is 1:7. However, since the centers are in operation ten and one-half hours per day while the teachers are only present for eight hours, there may be as many as twelve children per teacher at certain times of the day. At other times, for example early in the morning and late in the afternoon, there may be as few as two or three children per teacher.

Teacher hours are scheduled to provide maximum staff coverage for the hours of greatest need. A typical teacher schedule for a nursery school center might be as follows:

Teacher A	7 A.M. to 3 P.M.
Teacher B	8 A.M. to 4 P.M.
Director	8:30 A.M. to 4:30 P.M.
Teacher C and D	9:30 A.M. to 5:30 P.M.

Teachers eat lunch with their groups; they take a thirty-minute break during nap time when they are relieved by another teacher or by the director.

Following is a typical program for a day in a nursery school center:

A.M.	
7:00	Nursery school opens Health check by the teacher as children arrive Indoor play
8:00	Arrival of children continues Indoor play: books, puzzles, records, blocks, dramatic play, housekeeping play Outdoor play (weather permitting): climbing equipment, wheel toys, blocks, sand play, feeding pets
9:30	Morning snack: fruit juice, toast, cod-liver oil
10:00	Play activities in age groups: finger painting, easel painting, working with clay, music, stories, gardening, walks, woodworking, water play, dramatic play
11:15	Preparation for lunch: toilet, clean up, quiet play
11:30	Lunch
P.M.	
12:15	Preparation for nap
12:30	Nap
3:00	Wake up, dress, toilet, afternoon snack (including milk)
3:30	Play activities, indoor and outdoor, according to weather and needs of the children
4:30	Clean up for home Quiet play (music, stories)
5:30	School closes

While school is in session, the extended day-care program provides care and guidance for children before and after school hours. Activities are arranged in order to take account of the varied schedules of the different classes. During vacations and on school holidays the day-care center provides the children with a day-long program. Following are the typical schedules for schooldays and for vacations and holidays:

	Schooldays	*Vacations and Holidays*
A.M.		
7:00	Center opens, children arrive, health check, snack, indoor activities or outdoor free play	Center opens, children arrive, health check, indoor and outdoor free play
9:00	Grade school children depart for regular classes	Morning snack
10:00	Indoor activities and outdoor free play	Group and individual activities: puppetry, dramatic play, play house, reading, workshop, music, creative dancing, crafts, cooking, excursions, outdoor play equipment and games
10:30	Rest for P.M. kindergarten children	
11:30	Lunch for both kindergarten groups in school cafeteria	Clean up for lunch
12:00	Lunch for older children	Lunch
12:30	Free play for A.M. kindergarten children	
P.M.		
1:00	P.M. kindergarten children leave for kindergarten; A.M. kindergarten children rest	Rest periods according to age and special needs
2:00	First-grade children return to center; rest	Older children: woodworking, crafts, folk dancing, Spanish language, individual reading
3:00	All other children return to center, snack, indoor and outdoor free play	Snack, sometimes prepared by children; varied activities; indoor or outdoor play, work on special projects
4:30	All indoors for quiet activities	All indoors for quiet play, games, stories, music
5:45	Center closes	Center closes

Philosophic Orientation*

The primary purpose of the Santa Monica child-care centers is to provide a service which reinforces families when circumstances have made it necessary for mothers to work outside the home. Their service furnishes more than mere custodial care. The Santa Monica program also attempts to supplement family guidance during the crucial years of childhood. It is directed toward giving each child those things which will make it possible for him to grow and develop, to be happy and comfortable, by providing carefully planned activities and relationships.

* All material from here to end of this section is adapted from "The Present Santa Monica Child Care Program," Santa Monica Unified School District (unpublished).

Some of the important conditions which influence program design are:

1. The children receive fewer hours of attention and care from their parents than does the average child. Many spend more of their waking hours with their teachers than they do with their parents at home.
2. Most of the children come from homes in which the mother has the responsibility of both supporting them and caring for them.
3. Most of the children have had little or no experience with a father in the home.
4. While children in child-care centers spend a long day in a group-living situation, they may not always receive enough time for personal privacy.

Relations with Parents

The Santa Monica child-care program tries to work together with parents to plan ways in which to give the children those necessary services and experiences which cannot be supplied at home. A strong effort is also made to carry out a program of home-center relationships. In the nursery schools, occasional evening meetings, potluck suppers, and late afternoon coffee hours bring parents and staff together. For most parents, attending the evening meetings means that they must pay a sitter to stay with their children, and only about one-third of the parents attend these meetings regularly. The number of parents who attend the afternoon and supper meetings with their children is much larger.

In both the nursery school and extended day-care centers, informal parent-director conferences are held whenever a problem comes up. In the extended day-care centers, parent membership in the PTA is encouraged.

Services to Students

A special feature of the Santa Monica child-care program is that one unit, the John Adams Child Development Center, serves as a training center for secondary school and college students of child development, human behavior, and family relationships. Observation of and participation in the activities of the center gives these students an opportunity to see and work with young children in a real-life situation as a supplement to their classroom study.

In an average year, twenty classes (eighth grade through college) visit the John Adams Child Development Center. About 410 students observe or participate, for a total of 5,360 student hours. Individual student hours of assignment to the Center range from 1 to 90 per semester.

III. DIFFERENTIAL CHILD-REARING ATTITUDES OF CHILD-CARE PARENTS AND TEACHERS

The purpose of this section is to explore the child-rearing attitudes of parents and teachers of the children enrolled at the child-care center. Although there is a presumed relationship between attitudes and behavior, it is extremely difficult to predict with a high degree of precision the areas of congruence. Furthermore, the imperfections of any attitudinal device in ascertaining the validity of responses must always be considered. Nevertheless, attitudes do affect role prescriptions, expectations, and behavior, and it is important that some attempt be made to measure the relationship.

The study of child-rearing attitudes is an important part of the field of child development. There has been a gradual change away from the analysis of specific child-rearing practices (i.e., breast feeding, weaning, toilet training) and toward the study of attitudes underlying behavior. Current studies on attitudes have indicated various dimensions and factors (33, 43) and have traced the relationships between the personality of parents and their child-rearing attitudes (11, 26, 28, 55). More specific to this study are the findings of Lyle and Levitt (28) relevant to the relationship between authoritarianism-ethnocentrism in children and parental punitiveness, and those of Block (5) suggesting the restrictive parent as a prototype of the authoritarian personality.

Although the attitudes of various groups toward child-rearing practices have been explored, little is known about the attitudes of different groups working with the same children. In the child-care program, though parents and teachers are presumably working toward the same goals, they often have very different ideas as to how these goals are to be reached. Parents also differ greatly among themselves as to the correct ways of handling children. For example, some parents leave explicit instructions with the child-care teacher to "hit him hard if he doesn't obey," while other parents react strongly when the teacher places any restraint whatsoever on their children.

Two separate questions constitute the main part of this section. The first deals with differential attitudes and asks: "Are there differences between parents and teachers in attitudes of restrictiveness-permissiveness toward children?" The second deals with the concept of education and change and asks: "Can these attitudes be changed?"

Procedure

The sample of parents and teachers was drawn from all four Santa Monica child-care centers. All mothers registering their children in a specified month (N = 27) were tested, and all teachers working in the program during the same month (N = 14) were also given the test. The latter had earned teacher's credentials and had taken courses in child psychology and child development. All respondents were female.

The instrument used was one developed by Block (5) for determining parent attitudes along a restrictive-permissive dimension. The theoretical background of this scale is the concept of the so-called authoritarian

TABLE 5

Mean Score, Standard Deviation, and Probability between Parent and Teacher Scores on the Block Scale

Group	Number	Mean score	Standard deviation	't'	P
Parents	27	7.8	3.5	2.6	.02
Teachers	14	4.7	1.6	...	...

personality. Block's test instrument consisted of twenty true-false items. The higher the score, the more restrictive the attitude.

In order to explore the relationship between authoritarian-restrictive attitudes and education, the Block Scale was also given to seventeen students in an introductory psychology course.

Results

Results of the first phase of this study are presented in table 5. The parents showed significantly higher restrictive scores than the nursery school teachers. The parents also differed more among themselves.

Results of the second phase of the study, in which the test was administered to junior college students in an attempt to discover whether attitudes concerning child rearing can be changed, are presented in table 6. The students took the test on entering the class and again at the end of the semester. There was a significant shift in attitudes from restrictive to permissive, and mean scores at the end of the course were similar to the nursery school teacher group.

Discussion

There is the danger of conflict between parents and teachers in the child-care program because of their differences in attitude toward child

rearing. If such conflict is undesirable, a solution might be to attempt to educate the parents. The results obtained with junior college students suggest that this approach might be effective in fostering similar parent-teacher attitudes. However, it is possible to welcome such conflict on the grounds that children should be exposed to a variety of attitudes.

More basically: what is the Block Scale measuring? Does it actually measure basic personality patterns, or does it simply measure the extent to which a given group of subjects is aware of the socially desirable attitudes on child rearing? As other investigators have pointed out, exposure to courses in psychology enable a student to answer test questions in a more educated and sophisticated manner (14). It is debatable that any real personality change has occurred in the student

TABLE 6

MEAN SCORE, STANDARD DEVIATION AND LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE FOR JUNIOR COLLEGE STUDENTS ON THE BLOCK SCALE BEFORE AND AFTER TRAINING

Students	Number	Mean score	Standard deviation	't'	P
Before training.....	17	7.67	1.99	2.5	.05
After training.....	17	4.35	2.34	...	...

and that his actual behavior toward children has altered as a result of the course. Thus, even if the attitudes of the child-care parents *as measured by the Block Scale* could be changed by a program of education, there is no guarantee that their basic habits of behavior would become any different.

Many recent studies in the field of child development assume an even more tenuous connection. Typically, there is a test instrument used to differentiate parent attitudes, and an assumption made of a cause-effect relationship between these attitudes and the child's current behavior (11, 26, 28). Little is known about more basic and probably more influential variables such as the parent's motivation for having the child, the child's own aspirations and abilities, the role of the child in the family, and other external as well as internal influences. Until much more of this unknown area is charted, studies of the type described will contribute little to systematic research in the field of child development.

On the positive side, it should be pointed out, however, that the differences measured by the Block Scale between the attitudes of parents and teachers and the wide variability in the attitudes of the parents

had been observed directly by the child-care staff members. This fact partially validates the results of the Block Scale.

Still, broad attitudinal measures do not in themselves provide data about the actual interactive behavior between adult and child. For example, the following incidents are better indications of behavior than are attitudinal measures.

One rainy morning, Donald arrived at school late. He had walked all the way from his home alone, and although he had on a raincoat, he wore no rubbers; his sneakers were soaking wet, covered with mud, and full of holes. When teacher X saw him come in she exclaimed about it and about his tardiness; Donald cringed against the wall as if expecting to be scolded or struck. Instead, the teacher sat down with the child, comforted him, and helped him off with his wet things. She washed and warmed Donald's feet and gave his a pair of her slippers to wear; and when she saw that he could not keep them on, she took off her own moccasins and lent them to him. When her morning break came, the teacher went out to a nearby surplus store and bought Donald a new pair of sneakers. During the rest of the day, Donald, who in the past had avoided all the adults in the center, went to teacher X several times and spoke to her about his play.

The following incident involved the same teacher at another time with a different child:

Though she is quite young, Peter's mother has been divorced for several years. Peter is her only child. She holds a teaching credential, but says she hates teaching children; she has therefore, held a series of other jobs. She has never had a conference with the teacher and appears very little concerned with Peter's welfare. For example, one day when Peter fell at the playground and cut himself, the school nurse saw that stitches would be required. Peter's mother was reached by telephone, but her reaction to the news was irritation at being disturbed. She refused to go to the school to see Peter or to take him to a hospital. The subsequent behavior of the teacher toward Peter was seen to be much more protective than formerly.

The interaction between teacher and child in the first situation is clear; in the second example the mother is introduced, with her own role and expectations, and the effect of her behavior influences the interaction between teacher and child. Yet it is improbable that the actual behavior of either teacher or mother would be demonstrated by their replies to an attitudinal device.

The discrepancy between verbal and manifest behavior should be the focus of considerable research in the social sciences. The assumption has been that a high relationship exists between the two, and that measures of attitude are valid indicators of overt behavior. This may or may not be true, but since the assumption is crucial for most standardized tests or inventories, a mere assumption should not be sufficient.

It is our opinion that on many tests there is little relationship between the stated attitudes and manifest behavior; that a differential set of responses is learned on one level (intellectually) which has very little to do with behavior. Only deliberate teaching toward a congruence between verbal and manifest behavior achieves the kind of relationship assumed under test conditions.

Summary

In summary, results of the Block Scale indicated significant attitudinal differences between parent and teacher along a permissive-restrictive dimension which might lead to conflict in role perception, prescription, and expectation between the two groups. Further it was suggested that attitudes can be changed through education. A question was raised as to the true relationship between verbal and manifest behavior and about the validity of instruments attempting to assess the latter by testing the former.

IV. ADJUSTMENT OF PROBLEM AND NONPROBLEM CHILDREN TO SPECIFIC SITUATIONS*

In the two nursery school centers of the Santa Monica child-care program, children from two-and-one-half to five years of age spend up to ten hours a day away from home and parents. For many of these children, almost all of their waking life takes place in a school environment. Although some of the children in these centers appear to have made an excellent adjustment, several child-care staff members have said that over half the nursery school children seem to them to have problems of some sort, while nearly a third were considered as serious problems or seriously disturbed. The study described below was undertaken in order to find out more about this situation.

One difficulty in studying "problem children" lies in the identification of those who constitute problems. Some questions which we might ask are: How are certain children selected as problems? What types of behavior in what situations are seen as indicating a "problem child"? For example, emphasis may be put on active or on passive maladjustment. As studies by Wickman (54) and Beilin (4) have shown, teachers are usually most aware of overt and aggressive behavior as a problem, while mental hygienists are more concerned with the type of emotional trouble which is often associated with withdrawn and other nonsocial behavior. There has been some convergence between these views since the early Wickman studies, but complete congruence is unlikely to be achieved, nor perhaps is it desirable. Each profession naturally perceives the problem from its own point of view.

It was the purpose of this study to use concepts derived from role theory in order to test a hypothesis concerning problem behavior originally advanced by Cottrell (10) who deals with specificity of role expectations. Cottrell writes: "The degree of adjustment to roles which a society assigns to its age-sex categories varies directly with the clarity with which such roles are defined." If this is so, we would expect to find that children are not problems per se or in isolation, but that they become or are perceived as problems in relation to a dimension of expectations.

Procedure

The subjects for the study were 46 children (22 boys and 24 girls) enrolled in the John Adams Child Development Center and the

* This section was the basis for my article entitled "Adjustment of Problem and Nonproblem Children to Specific Situations: A Study in Role Theory," *Child Development,* 33 (1962), 229–233.

McKinley Nursery School. Fourteen of the children (8 boys and 6 girls) were considered by the staffs of the centers to be serious problems or to be seriously disturbed. Therefore, 32 children constituted the normal group and 14 children the problem group. Bower (7) offers evidence on the validity of teacher ratings in the diagnosis of problem children.

Several typical nursery school situations, such as school arrival, lunch, activities, wake-up after nap, dressing, going home, and free play were chosen for observation. The child-care teachers (eight respondents) were asked to write their descriptions of desirable and undesirable child behavior for each situation. The answers were analyzed, and in the final study, data were gathered only for those situations where the expectations were similar. It is interesting that the descriptions of what constituted favorable and unfavorable behavior in situations such as free play (e.g., "the child should play in a group"; "the child should play independently") varied so widely depending on the point of view of different personnel that identical behavior could be classified either as "normal" or "problem."

A seven-point rating scale was then prepared for each of the four remaining situations: lunch, wake-up after nap, dressing, and going home. An example follows:

SITUATION: DRESSING

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
dresses self independently			needs some help and direction			needs full attention

Two graduate students in social welfare separately observed and rated the children in both schools several times. Independent prerating and subsequent checking between the two observers and the use of the behavior rating scales ensured reliable observations. The raters were never told which children constituted the "problem" or "normal" groups.

Results

The mean scores of both groups of children are given in table 7. (The total rating of each child was the mean score obtained from one, two, or three observations: the number of observations of individual children varied because of absence at the times of rating.) In the case of "going home," the behavior of both parent and child was rated.

In all of the situations, the behavior of both groups of children and parents fell at the favorable end of the scale. In other words, the behavior of this sample was congruent with teacher expectations.

Total mean score for all situations was 2.26 for the "problem" children and 2.16 for the "normal." A "t" test between group means indicated that the between-group difference was nonsignificant. Inspection of mean scores between the groups in the specific situations also indicated nonsignificant differences leading to the acceptance of the null hypothesis.

The raters were also asked to comment on each situation from a more subjective point of view. A typical comment was: "I have never seen

TABLE 7

MEAN SCORE AND STANDARD DEVIATION BETWEEN PROBLEM AND NORMAL CHILDREN IN SELECTED SITUATIONS

Situation	Problem group (N = 14)		Normal group (N = 32)	
	Mean	Standard deviation	Mean	Standard deviation
Lunch	1.43	.65	2.13	.98
Wake-up	1.50	.65	2.00	1.39
Dressing	3.36	1.82	2.44	1.66
Going home:				
Child	2.64	1.74	2.03	1.31
Parent	2.36	1.26	2.19	1.33
Total mean	2.26	1.46	2.16	1.34

such a well-behaved bunch of kids." This was in direct contrast to the observed behavior of these same children in other than the specified situations.

DISCUSSION

Gross, Mason, and McEachern (22), in analyzing role behavior, indicate the fruitfulness of looking at role consensus as a social science variable. "That the members of a social system, whether a dyad or a total society, must agree themselves to some extent on values or expectations is a matter of definition. The point we have been trying to underscore is that the degree of consensus on expectations associated with position is an empirical variable whose theoretical possibilities until recently have remained relatively untapped" (22, p. 43).

The staff of the child-care center comprises a social system, and an analysis of consensus in terms of role expectations toward children in specific situations was one variable studied here. Initial attempts at obtaining role consensus as to what constituted "normal" and "prob-

lem" children on a more global level were not successful. The behavior of children in relation to specific situations was therefore selected as an object of study. It was found that only in the case of four specific situations was there agreement as to what constituted "normal" and "problem" behavior.

The other variable for this study was the actual observable behavior of the children in each of the specified situations. The children were divided into a "problem" and a "normal" group on the basis of interviews with the staffs. The hypothesis was that the "normal" group would show a higher degree of adjustment (as measured by the rating scale) to each of the situations than the "problem" group.

Analysis of the data disproved the hypothesis. There was no significant between-group difference in terms of the total score or in terms of any of the four specific situations. What was interesting was the high degree of adjustment of all children to each of the situations. It appears that if role prescribers (in this case teachers) will hold expectations for behavior which are similar and reasonable, then there will be little variation in the behavior exhibited by children in these situations. This was true even of children who were considered serious problems.

Where role expectations were clear, there was little room for confusion on the part of the children. Conversely, in situations where there was little consensus, there was much pupil confusion and it was obvious that teachers encouraged or discouraged behaviors on an individual basis—and at times different teachers encouraged completely opposed behaviors. This is, of course, not to be considered an "unhealthy" situation, but it points up the fact that children who are diagnosed as problems appear to be most maladjusted in unstructured situations.

What constitutes a problem child can then be analyzed from the point of view of expectations and behavior. A child who "hits" or "withdraws" cannot be regarded as a problem until (*a*) the situation and (*b*) the expectations of the observers have been analyzed. This is an unstated but obvious factor in all criteria for establishing "problems." For example, in most standardized psychological tests, expectations are associated with the test norms; discrepancy between the individual taking the test and the norm is usually seen as an indication of disturbance. Some of the conflicts between different professions regarding the diagnosis of a problem might be resolved by an analysis of the expectations common to various roles and positions, as well as by the more traditional method of concentrating on the "client."

Today, many clinicians restrict their interest to the personality of

the problem child. The findings of this study suggest that other variables, such as the demands and expectations placed upon the child, should also be explored and analyzed. Only through this broader approach can we reach a fuller understanding of children's behavior.

V. BEHAVIOR OF CHILD-CARE CHILDREN IN REGULAR SCHOOL

In general, researchers believe that children from one-parent families tend to exhibit adverse effects, and the evidence is in this direction, but a review of the literature fails clearly to support the conclusion. A recent comprehensive review of the literature is available in Stolz (47), and her comment on maternal employment is appropriate: "One can say almost anything one desires about the children of employed mothers and support the statement by some research study."

As has been indicated, a major failure of the studies relating one-parent and/or working mother families to some aspect of child performance is their failure to consider the kind and quality of care received by the child in its mother's absence; instead, most often, an independent variable, such as age of weaning, is related to a child's subsequent personality behavior. But the type of care received by these children would seem to be of major importance. For example, a child may be cared for by close relatives such as aunts or grandmothers, baby sitters, in day nurseries, or in private nursery schools, depending on the family structure, financial resources, and the mother's values.

The present section will examine the school behavior of children whose mothers are home or working who come from one-parent or two-parent families, as well as the school behavior of children from one-parent homes who have been placed in a child-care center. The structure of the home is therefore to be considered the independent variable, the school behavior of the children is the dependent variable, and the examination of the type and kind of care being received in a child-care center by children from one-parent families provides data on the type of care being received by one group.

Procedure

Most research concerning adjustment, adaptation, or behavior is faced with the difficulty of handling the dependent variable—behavior of the subjects. Many alternatives are present: for example, a psychological study might examine the relationship between maternal employment and certain psychological variables such as attitudes, psychological make-up, or ego strength; other studies might include direct observations of behavior, and some might utilize pseudo moralistic criteria such as "good" or "happy" as opposed to "bad and unhappy."

In this research, behavior is analyzed by using report-card records made by teachers, for the following reasons:

1. Teachers are used to grading.
2. Bower (7) indicates that teachers' ratings are as good as any other single instrument for analyzing behavior.
3. For the speed and ease in coding.

The dependent variable was evaluated on the basis of report-card grades for achievement in (*a*) regular academic subjects, (*b*) work and study habits, (*c*) citizenship.

Data on two of the criteria—grades for academic achievement and grades for work and study habits—showed no significant differences between the groups, and, therefore, is not presented for analysis; but the reports on citizenship are presented in detail. Citizenship was defined as "self control, courtesy, coöperation, dependability, respect for property, and respect for rights of others." (The phrase "personal and social development" was substituted for the term "citizenship" on the kindergarten report cards.)

Kindergarten children were graded either S (satisfactory) or N (needs to improve), while other classes received the traditional A, B, C, or D grades. In discussing grading standards, teachers agreed that A and B were satisfactory grades in citizenship, while C and D could be conceptualized as "needs to improve." Further discussion indicated that the concept of citizenship was similar to independence-dependence, conformity-nonconformity and compliance-noncompliance. The relationships among the following groups were analyzed:

1. Two-parent family, mother home
2. One-parent family, mother home
3. Two-parent family, mother working
4. One-parent family, mother working, independent arrangement of child care
5. One-parent family, mother working, child enrolled in a child-care center

The study was limited to these groups, since it was felt that for the purposes of the study, a relationship between these variables could be most easily established. The sample included all children from kindergarten through fifth grade enrolled in one elementary school in June, 1960. Sixth-grade children were not included in this study, since their records had been dispersed to other schools and were not available. The school served a lower middle-class white population in a low-rent district of small apartments and frame houses. Most of the parents were skilled or semiskilled workers or held sales or clerical jobs.

The sample comprised 299 children—174 boys and 125 girls. About half the children (151) had mothers who worked full time; 28 per cent of them came from one-parent (usually mother only) homes. It was planned to use one school serving a relatively homogeneous district in order to control the socioeconomic variable.

In order to analyze the relationship between attendance at a child-care center and subsequent school adjustment, preliminary plans also called for a survey of students in two junior high schools who had spent

TABLE 8

COMPARISON OF FAMILY COMPOSITION AND CHILD ADJUSTMENT TO SCHOOL

Family composition	Number of children	Needs to improve (per cent)
Two-parent, mother home	133	32
One-parent, mother home	15	40
Two-parent, mother working	81	46
One-parent, mother working, (non-child-care)	36	50
One-parent, mother working, (child-care)	34	54
Total	299	
Mother working	151	50
Mother home	148	32
Total	299	

at least one year in a child-care center. The results, surprisingly, revealed that out of approximately two hundred children who might be eligible for study, only seven child-care "alumni" remained in attendance in the district. Its extreme mobility, as shown by this figure, is a factor to be considered in any longitudinal study of the group. It is also interesting that of the seven remaining children, one was classified as emotionally disturbed.

RESULTS

Table 8 summarizes the over-all results, comparing the following groups: (*a*) two-parent family, mother home; (*b*) one-parent family, mother home; (*c*) two-parent family, mother working; (*d*) one-parent family, mother working; and (*e*) one-parent family, mother working, child enrolled in the child-care program.

Findings indicated that children of two-parent families where the

TABLE 9

PER CENT RATED C OR D (NEEDS TO IMPROVE) BETWEEN CHILDREN OF WORKING AND NONWORKING MOTHERS BY GRADE

Status of mother	Kinder-garten	First grade	Second grade	Third grade	Fourth grade	Fifth grade
Mother working	41	74	37	45	42	65
Mother home	3	53	21	29	46	50

TABLE 10

COMPARISONS BETWEEN CHILDREN OF ONE- AND TWO-PARENT FAMILIES, MOTHER HOME AND WORKING, USING OR NOT USING CHILD-CARE FACILITIES

	N	Satis-factory	Needs to improve
One-parent families:			
Mother home	15	9	6
Mother working (non-child-care)	36	18	18
Mother working (child-care)	34	16	18
Total, one-parent family	85	43	42
Two-parent families:			
Mother home	133	91*	42*
Mother working	81	44*	37*
Total, two-parent family	214	135	79
Mother home:			
Two-parent family	133	91	42
One-parent family	15	9	6

* Chi-square = 4.3, significant at .05 level.

mother stayed home received fewest "needs to improve" grades in citizenship; there was a gradual rise in the proportion of children in the "needs to improve" category, culminating in the high of 54 per cent for the child-care group.

Table 9 breaks the data down by grade level. For children initially entering school, there is a sharp difference between those whose mothers work and those whose mothers stay home; for example, 41 per cent of the kindergarten children whose mothers worked were rated "needs to improve" as against only 3 per cent of those whose mothers stayed home.

This difference gradually decreases until fourth grade where the groups were actually reversed.

Table 10 compares the different types of families with mother home and mother working. Chi-square in a fourfold contingency table (19, p. 265) was used to compare the following differences: one-parent family—mother home, mother working (child-care and non-child care); two-parent family—mother home and mother working. Nonsignificant

TABLE 11

CHI-SQUARE BETWEEN MOTHER HOME AND MOTHER WORKING BY SEX AND TOTAL

	N	Satis-factory	Needs to improve
Girls:			
Mother home	62	49	13
Mother working	63	41	22
Boys:			
Mother home	86	51*	35*
Mother working	88	35*	53*
Totals:			
Mother home	148	100**	48**
Mother working	151	76**	75**

* Chi-square = 6.6, significant at .05 level.
** Chi-square = 9.6, significant at .05 level.

results were found in all instances except for a chi-square of 4.3 between the two-parent family, mother working and mother home. This is significant at the .05 level.

Total group differences between two-parent and one-parent families with mother home in both groups were also computed and a chi-square of 2.5 was nonsignificant.

Essentially, the results indicated that a child from a one-parent family will have more "needs to improve" ratings than others and that children whose mothers work, even if from two-parent homes, will also face similar difficulty.

Table 11 compares children with mother home and mother working by sex, with the finding of a statistically significant difference between boys whose mothers worked and those whose did not.

Other comparisons between groups were not significant.

Discussion

One major criticism of analyzing structural variables such as the one-parent home and its relationship to child behavior is the lack of knowledge concerning intervening situations which presumably affect the dependent variable. The difficulties of inferring cause-effect relationships between specific child-rearing techniques (i.e., breast feeding) and subsequent maladjustment (48) is well known. A finding of major interest is the similarity among *all* children whose mothers were away from home, irrespective of the types of arrangements for their care.

Several possible explanations for the findings summarized in table 8 suggest themselves. For example, one might simply say that two-parent families in which the mother stays home create "well-adjusted" children. This would be the traditional view; however, one might equally well reverse the cause-effect relationship and conclude that in families where the children are troublesome the mother is more likely to want to escape to a job and the father is more likely to desert or divorce his wife. A third possibility would be that the absence of the father, the mother's employment, and the poor school adjustment of the children are all the result of variables which have not been measured.

It also might be suggested that the teachers' ratings themselves were responsible for the results of the study, assuming that the teachers tended to rate children according to their knowledge of the child's background. However, interviews with several teachers indicated that in general they are not well acquainted with the marital and employment status of each individual child's family. Furthermore, if there had been a bias in this direction, we might expect it to reveal itself in the grades given by the teachers in "work and study habits"—if not in the grades for academic achievement. However, as mentioned previously, no significant differences among the groups were noted in these categories.

As table 8 shows, the greatest proportion of "needs to improve" scores comes from the "mothers not home" group with the child-care group placing the highest. Since we have knowledge of the care and training received by the child-care group, an analysis of this program utilizing concepts drawn from role theory offers a plausible explanation for the difference.

The pertinent concept relates to the discrepancy between role expectations and performance—both for the child-care child and the teacher. Through interviews, it was found that child-care teachers are more apt to utilize a "mental health" frame of reference compared to the

elementary teacher's school-oriented criteria. The essential differences appear to be those of independence and expression—the child-care personnel encourages both while the regular school teacher expects more conformity and dependence. This difference in attitude is borne out in practice. Child-care children are taught and themselves acquire a great deal of self-reliance and independence. Even when they are not deliberately taught these qualities, the daily situation in which they must compete for the attention of the teacher with a group of peers much larger than most families, helps to foster them. Observations of child behavior in the centers revealed a high proportion of free choice decisions and independent problem solving. Child-care children tend not to look for direct help and guidance from the teacher in every situation.

Child-care teachers also become used to the relative independence of their youngsters. The showing of a movie on child growth and development to the child-care personnel brought forth such remarks as "How dependent the 'normal' child seems to be." Child-care children are also allowed to express their feelings relatively freely: to run, to shout, to sing, and so on.

Thus children in the child-care centers learn from their teachers and peers a student role which is essentially that of an independent, self-reliant youngster who is able to choose and carry out his own activities. When the time comes for these children to enter kindergarten they walk from their child-care room in the school building to another room in the school building which, superficially, look very much alike and where, as in the child-care center, a group of children are playing under the supervision of a teacher. But in this room the teacher's expectations are basically very different, and the typical student role is one of dependence and reliance on the teacher's direction. Most of the non-child-care children, who have never been away from their mothers in a school situation, are quite willing to assume this passive role. One can hypothesize, however, that the child-care children will begin by acting according to the student role that they have already learned. They will be surprised and confused, perhaps even frightened and/or angry, when the teacher objects to their behavior. The fact that these children still go to the child-care center every day before kindergarten, and return to the center after kindergarten is over, might be expected to increase the conflict and tension of the situation. It is not surprising therefore, that the kindergarten teachers should feel that these children "need to improve" in school adjustment.

It can be hypothesized that the same role conflict will probably occur

in most cases where the mother works fulltime, since children whose mothers are absent often tend to learn independence at an earlier age. (This would be true to some degree of all those children who have attended the type of private nursery school which fosters independence.) However, we should not expect the conflict to occur when the child has been cared for at home by someone who plays the role of a protective mother—for example, by a devoted grandmother or aunt. Further study of the relation between early school adjustment and the type of preschool experience a child has had would be desirable.

The above theory would also help to explain the fact that the effect of the mother's occupation variable decreases in the higher grades. (See table 9.) One might hypothesize, (*a*) that as they progress through the grades the children learn the behaviors necessary to the performance of an elementary school student role (and in the case of the child-care children learn to differentiate the schoolroom situation from the child-care situation); and (*b*) that since in the higher grades the student role requires more independence, there is less conflict between school and after-school expectations. Research on a longitudinal basis, following the same children as they progress through the school, will give us more information about these aspects of the problem.

The difficulty faced by the one-parent child in a setting such as the school should not be minimized. Goode (21) feels that the basic difficulty involves that of inadequate role models and that the boy or girl needs a parent of the opposite sex as a complementary figure with whom to enact role relations. And, even more fundamentally, the time and energy required to socialize children is so great that more than one parent is needed. The findings in table II comparing boys and girls add validity to this point of view. The segregation of children in a child-care center has other implications. By separation into age groups (i.e., the upper threes, the lower fours) there is the tendency to become "outer oriented" and the adjustment of children to a group (with minimal adult intervention) because of utmost importance. With a "tired mother" coming home at the end of the day, it would appear that the primary socializing roles are played by the child's peer group.

Summary

A summary of the findings indicates that:

1. Children from one-parent families are similar to all schoolchildren in academic achievement and work and study habits.

2. Children from one-parent families have difficulty in adjusting to certain school conditions.

3. Difficulty in citizenship exists, irrespective of the type of program and care, indicating that the one-parent family per se might possibly affect the relationship.

Children from two-parent families where the mother is employed also have difficulty in citizenship but not in academic achievement and work and study habits. In effect, the working mother creates conditions similar to that of the one-parent family.

5. Although there is initial difficulty in adapting to school for children of one-parent families, this difference gradually disappears.

VI. A CASE STUDY

Statistical generalization and quantification do not give a full picture of human behavior or the interaction of the various roles at the child-care centers. One method of presenting a more dynamic picture of staff, parent, and child interaction is the case study, where insights into some of the more subtle and probably important determinants of behavior can be shown taking place.

The following case is a composite; we will present a picture of the various roles as exemplified by the various participants under study.

The Mother

Mrs. J. is a pleasant, tired-looking woman of about thirty-five. Her manner during the interview was agreeable and coöperative, and she expressed the hope that we would have a chance to "talk out" several things that had been on her mind about her children and the child-care center. Her two children, Ann, age twelve, and Jimmy, age four, are enrolled in a Santa Monica center near her home: Jimmy from eight until five o'clock each weekday, and Ann from three (after her regular school hours) until five o'clock.

Mrs. J. explained that she had been in California for about nine months, having come here from Oregon one year after her divorce from Mr. J. She said she had decided to come to California because she remembered it favorably as the result of having lived here for several years shortly after her marriage.

Mrs. J. is employed as a checker in a supermarket where she earns $75 a week. She has never been to college or technical school and has no formal qualifications for more interesting or remunerative work.

The family live in a $90, one-bedroom, furnished apartment in a medium-rent district in Santa Monica, not far from the child-care center. Ann and Jimmy share the bedroom and Mrs. J. sleeps on a sofa-bed in the living room. Mrs. J. is trying to save up enough money to bring her furniture from storage in Oregon; she places great emphasis on this and feels that having their "own things" again will make a great difference to her children.

Mrs. J's children have been enrolled in the child-care center for five months. She had known no one upon her arrival in California and had been in a serious quandary about what to do with them while she was away during the day. She left Jimmy with a woman in her apartment building for two months. This woman had seemed neat and responsible and had small children of her own, but Mrs. J. says that her daughter

had gone out of the schoolyard at three one day to find Jimmy sitting by the school fence. He had wandered nearly eight blocks from the apartment building and the baby sitter had not even known he was gone. After this, Mrs. J. hired an older woman to come into her own apartment, but this woman was overly cautious and strict, never allowing Jimmy to get dirty or play with other children, "watching over him all the time like an old eagle." At this time, too, she began to notice behavior problems; Jimmy had tantrums frequently and began to wet the bed.

She was asked how she felt about most of the other mothers of child-care children. Her reaction was, "Oh, there are some I wouldn't care to—you know, but most are like me, I guess. Divorced or widows and working. There are sure a lot of women around with kids on their hands but no husband. Some of the mothers have pretty good jobs. Mrs. P. is a schoolteacher and she makes real good money. She's luckier than most, but I'm luckier than some. Take Mrs. Winston. She is about forty-five and her husband just died. Three kids. One is grownup, but two little ones are still at home, and she has to work as a cleaning lady. She's a very nice woman, she sure hasn't got much to look forward to."

Mrs. J. said she has had an opportunity to get acquainted or at least speak to most of the mothers of children in Jimmy's group at one time or another, "mostly at going-home time if the kids are slow or in the middle of something when we get there." She has not, however, discussed the child-care center with any of them.

Mrs. J. was asked if she had other observations to make about the type of care children receive at the child-care center. She said that Jimmy loves it, and since his enrollment there, several home problems such as tantrums and bed-wetting have been gradually improving. He is very fond of his teacher, and Mrs. J. worries at times that the teacher is becoming uppermost in Jimmy's affection. She knows that this is probably a groundless fear, "after all, he'd be starting school soon anyways and all kids like their teachers when they start school." But she nevertheless sometimes has the feeling that Jimmy would rather be at school with a teacher who "always seems to be kind and patient and where there are toys and other children" than at home with her. Once, during some remodeling at the market, she had several days off, during which she kept Jimmy home. She said he was very restless and unhappy and kept asking why he couldn't go to school, even though she had planned many activities for the two of them to share. This was very up-

setting to Mrs. J. and made her feel somewhat resentful of the school, although she knew this feeling was "silly."

Mrs. J. also has some doubts about some of the other children in Jimmy's group. She feels that he has learned some bad habits and at times will not conform to her ideas of dress and behavior because of what the other children do or wear. She admits, however, that this is probably inevitable and partly attributable to the neighborhood in which she lives. On the whole, she feels that the child-care center is a "real service—most kids would have it a lot worse otherwise, and this way you know they get good care and responsible people looking after them."

Most mothers of child-care children would agree with Mrs. J. Knowledge that their children are being handled by a well-trained professional staff gives them a feeling of security that most child-care arrangements would not. Some of them of course react with feelings of jealousy or fear that they are losing their children. Others react with guilt and insecurity, fearing that somehow they are not being good mothers because they are not with their children during the day. Still others definitely look forward to leaving their children and dread the hours at home evenings and week ends when they are reminded of their mother role. This type of ambivalence about their children is further illustrated by the following statement by Mrs. J.:

"Some days I can hardly wait to see Jimmy, and when I run into the center and he ignores me and seems to prefer the teacher, I see red. On other days I'm tired and think that my work day is ended but my mother day is just started. Then I see Jimmy and the good care he's getting and I feel lucky.

"After I get home and cook and put him down and clean up and do some of the housework I sometimes wonder why I just don't quit. I think most of us want a good man, but this is easier said than done. The way my life is I hardly get a chance anyway.

"This Saturday I'll take Jimmy to Pacific Ocean Park, and even if I know I shouldn't, I'll give him most everything he wants because I only have him the two days. I try to tell him that Saturday is his day and Sunday is for Mommy, but he just doesn't seem to understand. The older girl is much better about that."

In spite of ambivalent feelings, however, all the mothers verbalize a desire to sit down and discuss their children (and possibly their other problems) with the child-care personnel. Realistic factors of time and

physical limitations would undoubtedly limit attendance at such meetings if they were held, but any attempts in this direction would undoubtedly make the mother-child-teacher relationships much more effective.

On the whole, Mrs. J. appears to be a psychologically integrated woman who manages her life and her children effectively. Her role is a difficult one—she must attempt to be both mother and father, and without the aid of the child-care center it would appear that her position would become unmanageable. Her expectations for her children and for the kind of role she ascribes to the child-care center are not clear; that is, she wants the best care for her child but is unclear as to its definition. She is much more comfortable describing what she doesn't want—"sloppy homes," "sitters who don't care"—and all the different arrangements she has made for the care of her own children have been more or less motivated by negative conditions rather than based on a positive estimation of the kind of care she does want. The ordinary difficulties of parenthood are greatly increased in a situation such as Mrs. J.'s; yet at least for her, the child-care center is a most important solution to the problems she faced.

The Child

Jimmy J. is an attractive, four-year-old boy. He is slightly small for his age but is well coördinated and well nourished. His manner during the interview was at first attentive and coöperative; he appeared interested in responding to questions, verbalized readily, and sat quietly. As the interview progressed, however, he began to fidget and reply less freely and seemed anxious to return to his play.

Jimmy said he lived with his mother and sister in an apartment. He volunteered that he had "no daddy," and when asked specifically about his father, described a tall, kind man who brought many presents to himself and his mother and was very good at fixing things. He thought his father might be a cowboy. He also said that the father was sad because he was not able to live with his family.

Jimmy was asked about the places where he had been cared for before coming to the child-care center. He discussed these very freely. He had liked staying with Mrs. A. (the neighbor with children of similar age). Mrs. A. had been very nice and "laughed a lot." She gave him candy, allowed him to eat any time and let him "be a big boy." Jimmy said he could act like a big boy at Mrs. A's because she let him do what he wanted. When asked what he did do at Mrs. A.'s, Jimmy described tak-

ing walks and climbing on cars parked along the street. He expressed the feeling, however, that Mrs. A. liked the other children (her own) better.

His reactions to Mrs. P., the older woman who had kept him at his own apartment, were negative. "She washed me all the time. I couldn't have fun. She didn't know about having fun." Nevertheless, Jimmy felt that Mrs. P. was fond of him, though he was happy when his mother "sent her away."

Jimmy discussed his child-care experience very freely. He liked it. When asked what he particularly liked about it, he mentioned the toys, the teacher and his friends—in that order. When asked if there was anything he did not like about the center, he said there was a mean teacher (a teacher of another group who had reprimanded him in the play-yard for pushing a younger child). He also said he didn't like Bob. He described Bob (another child in his own group) as being too big, grabby, not sharing. Jimmy indicated that he sometimes reported Bob's behavior to the teacher, sometimes teacher spotted it independently, and sometimes Bob got away with "bad things," taking a toy or cracker. Jimmy added that his mother did not like Bob's mother.

Although Jimmy discussed his child-care experience in some detail, he was not as free in describing his home life. The only thing he would report was the fact that he had "treats on Saturday with Mommy." A few other statements he made about life at home seemed to be in phrases learned from his mother: "Mommy has to work hard to get money for us, so Ann and me go to school while she is at work." Or: "Saturday is for me and Sunday is for Mommy." After more questions were asked in this area, he became restless, uncommunicative, and inattentive, and finally said he wanted to go back and play.

Superficially it would appear that Jimmy is a normal, competent little boy and is functioning well in both home and child-care environments to the extent that the external circumstances of his life allow. That he accepts and enjoys the child-care center is evidenced by his free verbalization of his experiences there. His reticence regarding that area of his life connected with his mother and home situation would seem to indicate that he is unwilling and/or unready to discuss it.

Jimmy's nonverbalizing is quite typical of children his age. Another, perhaps better, method of obtaining his attitudes and opinions would be direct observation of the child and his peers. Although this cannot be done systematically, particularly when time is a critical factor, observation of the interaction of a group of children will often produce valuable insights. The children can often be heard comparing problems

and discussing themselves, but on the occasions when our observers stepped in and tried to develop these conversations, the children had nothing to say. It is probable that Jimmy may express his attitudes about his home life much more freely to other children, and only in a formal interview situation is he inexpressive or does he resort to repeating comments he had heard from his mother.

Jimmy is somewhat shyer and less able to relate with children than most of his peers. He often plays the passive role, more often waiting in line and depending on his teachers for direction than do some of his more outgoing, independent, and sometimes more aggressive peers.

Jimmy scored 112 on an I.Q. test administered by a graduate student in psychology. This is a little higher than the mean score for his group. He is sometimes observed in a corner engaging in quiet activities and appears to be more comfortable in these situations.

Over-all evaluations of the children by the staff of the child-care center vary considerably. One teacher reports that "all of these children have problems," while another insists that these children are as normal as any group of children. We would take a more cautious approach: that the background of these children provides a higher probability of certain kinds of difficulties, but also that children appear to have enormous ability to adapt to most situations.

In the center there are several children who exhibit problem behavior—one who is extremely hostile and destructive, another boy with many effeminate characteristics; and there are several parents who would also be cause for concern—one who is extremely overaffectionate and dependent on her child, and another exhibiting overt rejection and distaste. Our general impression is that the group at this moment in time does not appear to be grossly different from any other group of youngsters. Only under certain circumstances do unusual kinds of behavior appear—the most common being the quick and almost pathetic demonstrations seeking attention from males by these children whose world is so predominantly female. A male observer walking through the center has difficulty making headway through the children clamoring to be heard.

The Teacher

Mrs. T., the teacher of Jimmy's group at the child-care center, is a heavy, energetic woman of about forty. Her husband is the vice-principal of another elementary school, and they have two children, both of whom are now in junior high school. Mrs. T. has only recently

returned to work; she was trained in nursery education in college, but raising a family occupied the first years of her marriage, and the child-care center is her first actual work experience.

Mrs. T. was asked to give her impressions of the child-care center, how she liked it, her opinion of its facilities, staff, and program. She was quite enthusiastic about most aspects of the center. She enjoys working with the children, of most of whom she is very fond, and had great praise for her fellow staff members. She did say that she found the work quite tiring but related this to her age and to being unaccustomed to working outside her home.

When asked if she planned to remain at the child-care center, Mrs. T.'s answer was a qualified yes. She likes the work, but her husband repeatedly—and accurately—points out that there would be more advantages to working in the elementary schools. Child-care center personnel work for eleven months a year, as opposed to nine months in the other, and the rate of pay is therefore proportionately lower. Mrs. T. considers this unfair, and said that she would certainly remain with the child-care center if the situation were corrected. Although she did not specifically say so, she gave the impression that she might some day take the few courses required to bring her elementary credential up to date, and, unless conditions changed, might leave the center for employment in regular school. This would be a loss to the child-care program.

In reply to questions about the specific program of the child-care center, Mrs. T. made several observations. She understands that some theories of child care and development have changed since she received her academic training, and she appreciates the opportunity for professional development afforded by working with the administration of the center and observing the current practices and philosophies. She noted that she particularly sees a difference between her own attitudes and ideas and those of the youngest staff members who have just graduated from college. She has often had questions regarding these differences, but has not been able to investigate or pursue them, and feels that many times her questions are left unanswered because of the pressure of time. She feels strongly that the child-care staff should meet to discuss and iron out some of these questions. Better communication among staff members is the need she considers uppermost. She also would like to have more opportunity to discuss with other staff members problems concerning specific children, and would like on occasion to have access to trained psychologists, social workers, and/or medical people.

Mrs. T. was asked about her appraisal of Jimmy J. She felt that in

general, Jimmy was a very self-sufficient child. She seemed very fond of him; in fact, she referred to him several times as "that poor little guy" or "poor little sweetie" and in general gave the feeling that her attitude was somewhat maternal and protective. Previous observation of Jimmy and his group supports this conclusion; Mrs. T. often assumed a protective role in the group situation.

Mrs. T. was asked to describe her impressions of Jimmy's mother. Her reaction was quite negative. She felt that Jimmy was being neglected, was not properly clothed or fed, and did not have a satisfying life at home. She wondered if Mrs. J. went out a lot at night. She felt that Mrs. J. had a somewhat hostile attitude about the child-care center and in general impeded Jimmy's development there by her attitude. She expressed the hope that she would be able to continue to work with Jimmy, "because he is such a likeable little boy and does have a rough time, I think." Then she went on to describe Jimmy coming to school on Mondays with descriptions of Pacific Ocean Park and having a lot of money spent on him by his mother. "She seems to be trying to compensate for her inattention by buying him anything he wants on Saturday. She seems to have little understanding of his real needs." Mrs. T. then went on to describe experiences she had in raising her own children to illustrate her point that "you can't buy affection or provide security by overindulgence."

In general, Mrs. T. gives the impression of being a competent and conscientious teacher. She is interested in the theories of child development and in the actual development of specific children in her group. Her relationship with the children seems extremely good, as it does with most of the mothers. In the case of Jimmy's mother, her attitude seems unduly harsh, and it may be seen from this that closer communication between parents and teachers would have valuable results for the children involved in the child-care program. It would be extremely helpful for the teacher to gain more understanding of the problems of many child-care mothers, and they should also be helped to understand better the reasons for some of their own actions and reactions. In this area, staff conferences wherein teachers could discuss with one another particular incidents and children, could be most helpful, and efforts have already been made in this direction.

Our impression is that the caliber of teachers in the child-care centers is high; they are well motivated and would like to know more about child behavior. Almost without exception they have good relationships with the children. In one sense the situation eliminates the poorer teachers—

the close quarters and constant interaction with children and directors would almost guarantee that only the better ones survive.

Several questionnaires were given to all the teachers during the course of the study. The answers indicate that the group has a child development orientation; that is, they perceive their work as helping individual children to develop and grow, as opposed to a baby-sitting or strict teacher-learner point of view. This orientation is especially strong among administrative personnel of the centers.

The Social Worker

Miss L. is the social worker who conducted the interviews with child-care parents, teachers, and children—including Jimmy, his mother, and his teacher. Miss L. also spent some time observing the children and the child-care program. She was asked to state her evaluation and impressions, which were as follows:

"When I first started my observations at the center, I was highly impressed. They have things for children and although some of the equipment is old, you can tell the facilities have been designed with specific theories behind them and with real interest in the children. They don't want it to be just a day nursery or anything like that. That is something that does come across—that there is sound orientation to child development and to child-care philosophy behind the present curriculums and projected plans, so that the caliber of the program is most impressive.

"Well, of course, after I had been there for a time I could see that things were perhaps not as ideal as they had seemed superficially. They do have problem children, some of them, and problem parents. I noticed things that could be better, or specific incidents that I would have handled differently myself. Some of the other things I noticed would be that the teachers have to work terribly hard, and I often felt that a larger staff would make things immeasurably better. Or if they had more facilities for obtaining consultations with psychologists or child-behavior specialists I think the teachers would feel able to deal more confidently with some of the things that come up. I think that overload and lack of communication would be the two main problems.

"Still, when I make an over-all evaluation, I realize that you have to take into consideration the fact that the teachers, the parents, and the children are individuals, and any situation involving human relationships is bound to have some problems in interaction. The child-care center is basically a sound, well-designed and well-functioning program.

Things could be done to improve it. Specifically, I would mention the things mentioned by most of the people I interviewed. There should be more opportunities for the teacher to discuss things with parents and also more staff interaction. An in-service training program, such as found in social work, would be invaluable, I should think. For one thing, this would allow each teacher, no matter what her background, to understand the philosophy under which the child-care center operates, and thus ensure a more uniform approach to dealing with various children and problems. And if the mothers had access to the teachers, to discuss their children's and perhaps their own problems, or even if the mothers had access to specialists, the general effectiveness of the program would be much greater. The program is already very comprehensive, but with some added services, its usefulness to the whole community might be doubled."

Miss L. is a social worker doing her graduate fieldwork training at the child-care center. This is a unique arrangement since most centers do not have the services of skilled outside help. It is another indication of the quality of the care offered by the center under study.

VII. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Recent statistics released by the United States Department of Labor indicate that, for the first time in history, half of all women employed in this country are working wives. More than one out of every six married women between the ages of twenty and sixty-four now hold jobs, and half of these women have children of school age or younger. There are more than six million mothers in our labor force today. The steady growth both in the total number of working women and the proportion of working mothers suggests that the demand for some form of day care for the children of these mothers will continue to expand in the years to come. In addition, the rising rates of divorce and separation assure an increasing need for care of children from one-parent families whose mothers must work to support them.

In general, the problems facing the single mother and employed mother are not easy of solution. If she has independent means, she may hire a private baby sitter or take care of her children herself; on the other extreme would be the mother who utilizes the public welfare programs. The present study examines another type of program of care for children from one-parent families, the child-care center. These centers should be viewed as an alternative and not a substitute for any other kind of program. It appears obvious that no single program can take care of all the problems raised by single parenthood, but the child-care centers offer another opportunity for the woman who desires to work and obtain professional care at a reasonable rate for her child while she does so.

There are distinct advantages to a child-care program. Systematic research can be conducted. Standards can be set and maintained. The implications for child development are many, and coöperative efforts between highly motivated professional teachers and researchers would provide basic data concerning many of the questions plaguing the social scientist interested in child development.

The current study was designed to analyze the child-care center program and the children, parents, and teachers involved in it. Concepts derived from role theory were utilized as intervening variables in order to understand better the behavior of all participants in the child-care program.

A review of the literature in the field indicates contradiction and confusion regarding the behavior of children in a one-parent family. Much of the difficulty stems from the utilization of a limited research model, the use of the broken home as the independent variable, and

some aspect of child adjustment as the dependent variable. Data usually derived from this basic model and its variations must take into account (*a*) the grossness of the concepts, (*b*) the need for better definitions of the parameters to be measured, (*c*) the intervening stimuli, and (*d*) the need for a clear, preferably behavioral, measure of the dependent variable. It is probable that the continued conflicting or insignificant findings in this area point to the need for a more systematic attack on the problem and/or for development of new theoretical and research models. The present study is an attempt to provide a more systematic attack on the problem through an analysis of the kind of care being received by a selected group of children.

The findings indicate that parents and teachers differ in role prescriptions for their children (section iii). This was explained by differential education and training.

Section iv suggests that clear, realistic expectations do much toward helping "problem" children perform appropriately, while diverse and conflicting prescriptions result in problem behavior.

Section v compares the behavior of child-care children and non-child-care children. The findings indicate a significant difference between the behavior of one-parent child-care children and children from two-parent families, mother home. This was explained in terms of the development of a more independent role by the child-care student. Other family groups, defined structurally—including intact homes where the mother is employed—show a similar difference and were also explained as the development of greater independence in child-care children. This finding probably adds to the current confusion concerning structural variables and child adjustment, but the explanation appears to be logical and appropriate.

Section vi shows the process of development of each of the general roles included in a child-care center—the child, teacher, and parent—and how different perceptions, expectations, and behavior can be perceived differently by individual participants. The case-study approach is often the most difficult to defend in research terms, but it does add immeasurably to an understanding of behavior at the present time.

Other studies which would add to the understanding of the behavior of child-care participants range from a study of the social system of the school—the role of the child-care center in the over-all school structure and the perceptions and behavior of the staff and clientele in relation to the system—to individual personality studies of each child as determinants of behavior. The crucial study would be a longitudinal one

where the children and families currently under observation are followed for a long period of time. Predictions have been made that difficulties of adaptation are faced by most of these families, and it would be worthwhile to see if these predictions are borne out by subsequent facts. An interesting finding is the degree of mobility of the current sample. When attempting to examine the records of children of junior high school age who had previously been enrolled in child-care centers (section v), it was found that fewer than 5 per cent were still attending school in the area.

Problems

In the child-care centers, the staff too often has neither the time nor the training to deal with special problems that frequently arise. At present, the only help available to the program comes from a school psychologist who visits each center for two hours every second week.

An experienced school psychologist can aid the staffs of the centers in many ways: by observing and interviewing children who are having difficulties, through individual conferences with teachers and directors, and by watching the child-care program in progress and discussing its psychological aspects with the staff. It seems highly desirable that the psychologist should spend more time in the centers by increasing the number and/or length of his visits.

The advice and help of a skilled social worker would also be of great value to the child-care program. Very often, the problems which come up stem directly or indirectly from the home situation of the children. Child-care staff members have neither the time nor the training to visit the homes or help the families of the children in their groups. Moreover, they are usually not aware of the local resources which are available to meet the often desperate economic, medical, legal, and social needs of these families. Yet very often, the parents of child-care children have no one else to turn to with their troubles. They are often strangers in town, cut off from friends and relatives, and unwilling to ask for "charity." Their guidance by someone who has experience in dealing with families in trouble, and knowledge of local laws and organizations designed to help such families, and who is affiliated with the center, would be invaluable to the child-care program. Ideally, a trained social worker should be scheduled to visit each center at least once a week to consult with the staff and, when necessary, to speak directly to the parents.

The child-care centers are already making some effort to bring the

parents together and to work with them. More should be done along these lines. The study of attitudes toward child rearing (see section iii) revealed that the parents of child-care children differ widely in their ideas about how to bring up children, and that many of them have extremely rigid, authoritarian attitudes. There is some doubt whether a parent education course, even if it resulted in a measurable change of attitudes on the part of the parents, would actually produce a change in their behavior toward their children. Nevertheless, such a course might have some effect, particularly if it were closely related to the actual problems and experiences of the child-care children. Unfortunately, since parents of all child-care children work during the day, and since most of them would find it a financial hardship to pay a baby sitter to enable them to attend meetings at night, there would be problems involved in scheduling the course.

The child-care centers in Santa Monica are now housed in school buildings designed for other purposes which have been converted to the needs of the program. In some respects the resulting setup is good, in others it is less than adequate. For example, in one nursery school center children must take their naps in a room which also serves as the main passage leading to the kitchen, office, entrance, bathroom, and dining area. In the extended day-care centers, more space and equipment for a wider variety of activities of the kind interesting to older children (e.g., arts and crafts, workshop, dramatics, outdoor games) are desirable. A new child-care center, specially designed for children's use, has just been opened.

Despite the fact that the Santa Monica child-care centers already receive more applications than they can accept, there is no question that many parents in the area whose children are eligible for enrollment do not know they exist. Those who do apply have heard of the centers by accident from a neighbor or friend at work; they often remark that they would have enrolled their children in the program long before had they known about it. There are several ways in which to spread publicity about the child-care program: through articles in local newspapers and by working more closely with schools, churches, and other organizations whose function it is to know of families needing child-care services. Other potential applicants could be reached by contacting the personnel departments of large plants and offices in Santa Monica employing working mothers. It might be argued that the demand for enrollment in the child-care centers already far exceeds the supply so that publicizing them is unnecessary and undesirable.

Not the least important are the needs to revise the procedure for selecting personnel and to adopt a salary scale which would attract and hold the kind of teachers who are essential to the success of the program.

Through these measures, the value of an already well-designed and well-functioning program would be greatly increased, and the benefits of such a program would be even larger—to the children and parents involved, to the community which it serves, and to the social scientist.

The last, but perhaps most important, function of the child-care center is to teach children and parents the student role. Perhaps teach is too strong a word in this case and it would be more accurate to say to provide opportunities for learning the student role. The importance of developing behavior appropriate for a student role in our culture cannot be overestimated since successful adaptation to the schools is in many cases successful adaptation to life. The stimulation of books, toys, and apparatus, the interaction with peers, and the reinforcement of attitudes, values and behavior appropriate for subsequent learning roles are provided for on a systematic basis in the child-care center.

Serious consideration should be given to expanding the child-care center program to include other groups than one-parent families. The cost of such an expansion would appear to be negligible when weighed against the costs of crime, delinquency, and unemployment since such social problems are often associated with early school drop-outs and the inability to function in a student role. For a successful student role assumes and requires an acquaintance and eventual acquisition of certain attitudes, values, norms, and behaviors. Unfortunately, segments of our society are unable to perform according to larger societal expectations and thus are unable to utilize to the maximum the legitimate opportunities that are available in the society. A sound program similar to the one described in this monograph could well be a first step toward providing the essential ingredients for mastering the student role which in turn should aid in developing the future role of the productive citizen.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Altus, W. D. The broken home and factors of adjustment. *Psychological Reports,* 1958, Vol. 4, p. 477.
2. Bach, G. R. Father-fantasies and father-typing in father-separated children. *Child Development,* 1940, Vol. 17, pp. 63–80.
3. Baker, J. W., and Annette Holzworth. Social histories of successful and unsuccessful children. *Child Development,* 1960, Vol. 32, pp. 135–149.
4. Beilin, H. Teachers' and clinicians' attitudes toward the behavior of problems of children: a reappraisal. *Child Development,* 1959, Vol. 26, No. 1, pp. 9–25.
5. Block, J. Personality characteristics associated with fathers' attitudes towards child-rearing. *Child Development,* 1959, Vol. 26, No. 1, pp. 41–48.
6. Bossard, J. H. S., and Elenor Stoker Boll. *The sociology of child development.* New York: Harper and Brothers, 1960.
7. Bower, E. A process for early identification of emotionally disturbed children. *Bulletin California State Department of Education,* 1958, Vol. 27, No. 6.
8. Bowlby, J. Unhappy marriage, desertion, separation and divorce. Monograph Series, No. 2. Geneva: World Health Organization 1952.
9. Campbell, M. The effect of the broken home upon the child in school. *Journal of Educational Sociology,* 1932, Vol. 5, pp. 274–281.
10. Cottrell, L. S., Jr. The adjustment of the individual to his age-sex roles. *American Sociological Review,* 1942, Vol. 7, pp. 618–625.
11. Dickens, S. L., and C. Hobart. Parental dominance and offspring ethnocentrism. *The Journal of Social Psychology,* May, 1959, Vol. 49, pp. 297–303.
12. Douglas, J. W. B., and J. M. Blomfield. *Children under five.* London: Allen, 1958.
13. *Educational Code* (State of California). Sections 19601.5–19601.7.
14. Edwards, A. L. *The social desirability variable in personality assessment and research.* New York: Dryden Press, 1957.
15. Essig, M., and D. H. Morgan. Adjustment of adolescent daughters of employed women to family life. *Journal of Educational Psychology,* April, 1946, Vol. 37, p. 219.
16. Favez-Boutonier, J. *Mental health and infant development.* New York: Basic Books, Vol. 1, p. 140.
17. Freudenthal, K. Problems of the one-parent family. *Social Work,* 1959, Vol. 4, No. 1, pp. 44–48.
18. Gardner, G. E. Separation of parents and the emotional life of the child. *Mental Hygiene,* 1956, Vol. 40, pp. 53–64.
19. Garrett, H. E. *Statistics in psychology and education.* New York: Longmans, Green, 1953.
20. Glueck, S., and Eleanor Glueck. *Unraveling juvenile delinquency.* Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 1950.
21. Goode, W. J. Family disorganization. In *Contemporary Social Problems,* ed. by R. K. Merton and R. A. Nisbet. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1961.
22. Gross, N., W. S. Mason, and A. W. McEachern. *Explorations in Role Analysis.* New York: John Wiley, 1958.
23. Hodgkiss, M. The influence of broken homes and working mothers. *Smith College Studies in Social Work,* March, 1933, Vol. 3, pp. 259–274.

24. Ingham, H. V. A statistical study of family relationships in psychoneurosis. *American Journal of Psychiatry,* 1949, Vol. 106, p. 91.
25. Josselyn, I. M., and R. S. Goldman. Should mothers work? *Social Service Review,* March, 1949, Vol. 23, pp. 1–14.
26. Kates, S. L., and L. N. Diab. Authoritarian ideology and attitudes on parent-child relationships. *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology,* July, 1955, Vol. 5, No. 1, pp. 13–16.
27. Lajewski, H. C. U.S. Children Bureau Publication #378. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1959.
28. Lyle, W. H., Jr., and E. E. Levitt. Punitiveness, authoritarianism, and parental discipine of grade school children. *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology,* July, 1955, Vol. 5, No. 1, pp. 42–46.
29. Lynn, D. B., and W. L. Sawrey. The effects of father-absence on Norwegian boys and girls. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology,* 1959, Vol. 59, pp. 258–262.
30. McCarthy, D. Trends in the psychological appraisal of children. *Child Development,* 1955, Vol. 26, pp. 213–222.
31. McGregor, H. G. Physical examination of 2,000 cases of neuroses. *Journal of Neurology, Neurosurgery, and Psychiatry,* 1947, Vol. 7, p. 521.
32. Madow, L., and S. E. Hardy. Incidence and analysis of the broken family in the background of neurosis. *American Journal Orthopsychology,* 1947, Vol. 17, pp. 521–528.
33. Milton, G. A. A factor analytic study of child-rearing behavior. *Child Development,* 1958, Vol. 29, No. 3, pp. 381–392.
34. Monahan, T. P. Broken homes by age of delinquent children. *The Journal of Social Psychology,* 1960, Vol. 51, pp. 387–397.
35. ———. Family status and the delinquent child: a reappraisal and some new findings. *Social Forces,* 1957, Vol. 35, pp. 250–258.
36. Newcomb, T. M. *Social Psychology.* New York: Henry Holt, 1959.
37. Nye, F. I. Child adjustment in broken and unhappy unbroken homes. *Marriage and Family Living,* 1957, Vol. 19, pp. 356–361.
38. Public Law 150, Seventy-eighth Congress, Chapter 240, First Session.
39. Rouman, J. School children's problems as related to parental factors. *Journal of Educational Research,* 1956, Vol. 50, pp. 105–112.
40. Rowntree, G. Early childhood in broken families. *Population Studies,* 1955, Vol. 8, pp. 247–265.
41. Russell, I. L. Behavior problems of children from broken and intact homes. *Journal of Educational Sociology,* 1957, Vol. 31, pp. 124–129.
42. Scarff, R. C. Special disabilities in reading and arithmetic of students from broken homes. *Indiana University School of Education Bulletin,* 1933, Vol. 10, pp. 70–84.
43. Schaefer, E. S., and R. Q. Bell. Development of a parental attitude research instrument. *Child Development,* 1958, Vol. 29, No. 3, pp. 339–361.
44. Sears, R. R., E. E. Maccoby, and H. Levin. *Patterns of Child Rearing.* Evanston: Row, Peterson, 1957.
45. Shaw, C. R., and H. D. McKay. Are broken homes a causative factor in delinquency? *Social Forces,* 1932, Vol. 10, pp. 514–524.

46. Smith, P. M. Broken homes and juvenile delinquency. *Sociology and Social Research,* May–June, 1955, Vol. 39, pp. 307–311.
47. Stolz, L. M. Effects of maternal employment on children: evidence from research. *Child Development,* 1960, Vol. 31, pp. 749–782.
48. Terrell, G. The need for simplicity in research in child psychology. *Child Development,* 1958, Vol. 29, pp. 303–310.
49. Thorman, G. *Problems of family life.* New York: Harper and Brothers, 1956, pp. 144–163.
50. Toby, J. The differential impact of family disorganization. *American Sociological Review,* 1957, Vol. 22, pp. 505–512.
51. Torrance, P. The influence of the broken home on adolescent adjustment. *Journal of Educational Sociology,* 1945, Vol. 18, pp. 359–364.
52. Wallenstein, N. Character and personality of children from broken homes. *Teachers College Records,* 1938, Vol. 39, pp. 747–748.
53. Weeks, H. A. Male and female broken home rates by type of delinquency. *American Sociological Review,* August, 1940, Vol. 5, pp. 601–609.
54. Wickman, E. K. *Children's behavior and teachers' attitudes.* New York: Commonwealth Fund, 1928.
55. Zuckerman, M., and M. Otean. Some relationships between maternal attitude factors and authoritarianism, personality needs, psychopathology, and self-acceptance. *Child Development,* 1959, Vol. 30, pp. 27–36.

R.W.B. JACKSON LIBRARY
3 0005 03035922 1
370.78
C153U
v.12, no.5
California. University.
University of California
publications in education

370.78
C153U
v.12, no.5
California. University.
University of California publications
in education